UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,033	04/29/2005	Pekka Kangasnicmi	PLA078-820708	2853
WOLF BLOCK SCHORR AND SOLIS-COHEN LLP 250 PARK AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			WILSON, JOHN J	
NEW YORK,	NEW YORK, NY 10177		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			3732	• • •
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	01/28/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO@WOLFBLOCK.COM

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/517,033	KANGASNIEMI, PEKKA			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John J. Wilson	3732			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN. 136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become a	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 (</u>					
·	,—				
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	•	•			
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) <u>13-27</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrays s/are allowed. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>13-27</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1 Certified copies of the priority document 2 Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in ority documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date			
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of 6) Other: _	Informal Patent Application			

L)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (4321040) in view of Zdarsky (5516287). Miller shows a root canal instrument 10, needle part 13, a gripping member 12 having a substantially continuous outer surface as shown, which can be gripped by the fingers, and is recoverably deformable, Fig. 14. Miller teaches using the material nylon, which generally does not have a coefficient of friction greater then .4. Zdarsky teaches using a silicon rubber surface 4 for gripping and for the purpose of providing for high grippability, column 2, lines 6-14. It is held that the silicon rubber used, in view of the purpose for use, inherently has a high coefficient of friction and obviously has a coefficient of friction greater then .4. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Miller to include the use of a gripping material as taught by Zdarsky in order to improve the grippability. The specific range of the coefficient of friction of the material used is an obvious matter of choice in the degree of a known parameter to achieve a predictable result to one of ordinary skill in the art. Miller does not specifically state the material of

Application/Control Number: 10/517,033

Art Unit: 3732

٠,

the needle. It is well known to make endodontic needles from a metallic material. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to us a metallic needle as is well known in the art. Miller does not disclose the ranges of the Shore hardness of the materials used, however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manufacture the root canal instrument within the specifically claimed ranges of shore hardness, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's remarks are held to be moot in view of the newly applied references and rejection above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Wilson whose telephone number is 571-272-4722. The examiner can normally be reached on Maxi-Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on 571-272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John J Wilson/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

Jw January 15, 2008